

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 6, 7, 14 and 16-37 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 15 stand rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Office states that the disclosure stands objected to because on page 8, line 2, the specification states that Figure 4 shows the ribs 6 and 16 extending parallel to one another, but Figure 4 does not show ribs 6 and 16 extending parallel to one another.

Applicants have amended the specification to indicate that, "As shown in Fig. 1 ribs 6 extend parallel to one another. In Fig. 3, ribs 16 extend parallel to one another."

The Office states that the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicants have inserted Table 1 (on page 11) to indicate the properties of the liner/insulator, specifically the wet compression percentage, dry compression percentage and dry wet recovery percentage

Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 4,474,846 to Doerer et al.

Doerer et al. disclose a moldable fibrous mat from which a permanently rigid product of predetermined shape can be molded by the application of heat and/or pressure (Abstract). Col. 6, lines 9-20 of Doerer et al. teach that the web of mat material after it

leaves the oven advances through a crimping device which in the case a pair of crimping rolls between which the web passes. The rolls are cylinders arranged with their axes crosswise of the direction of web travel and have on their cylindrical surfaces, spaced, parallel ribs which may, for example, extend either axially or circumferentially. **The ribs impress a pattern of grooves or indentations on both surfaces of the web** to further increase flexibility of the web, permitting it to be handled and bent or flexed to even greater degree without breaking. [Emphasis added].

Nowhere do Doerer et al. teach or suggest a plurality of **ribs of fibrous material thermally bonded** to said base layer. Doerer et al. specifically teach ribs are impressed as grooves or indentations and not fibrous material thermally bonded to a base layer as Applicants claim.

Further, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2. Claims 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof.

Claims 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 in view of Doerer et al. be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2. Claims 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 in view of Kelman et al. be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 9-11 under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 2 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 4,474,846 to Doerer et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 6,497,950 to Haile et al.

Applicants submit that Doerer et al. fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. As indicated above, nowhere do Doerer et al. teach or suggest a plurality of **ribs of fibrous material thermally bonded** to said base layer. Doerer et al. specifically teach ribs are impressed as grooves or indentations and not fibrous material thermally bonded to a base layer as Applicants claim. As such, at least one of the criteria for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the applied reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. Further, the fact that the claimed invention is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art is not sufficient by itself to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. See MPEP §2143.

Claims 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 as being unpatentable over Doerer et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of Haile et al. be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 8 under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doerer et al. (4,474,846) as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 5,892,187 to Patrick.

For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Doerer et al. fails to teach all of Applicants' claim limitations. As such, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not be made.

Claims 4 and 8 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 8 as being unpatentable over Doerer et al. (4,474,846) as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 5,892,187 to Patrick be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 9-11 under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 2 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman as applied to claim 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 6,497,950 to Haile.

Haile specifically teaches the use of blending glass fibers with nonwoven fabrics, col. 13, lines 58-64:

Binder fibers from this invention are readily blended with a wide range of other fibers and subsequently heat or energy activated to provide nonwoven fabrics having good integrity and strength. For example, other fibers in the blends could include, but are not limited to polyester, acrylic, nylon, glass, cellulosic (cotton, pulp-based fibers, cellulose ester fibers, etc.) as well as other synthetic and natural fibers. [Emphasis added].

Further, Haile fails to teach or suggest "glass bicomponent fibers" as Applicants claim (newly amended claim 1). As such, Haile does not teach all of Applicants' claim limitations. As such a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met.

Claims 2 and 9-11 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 2

and 9-11 as being unpatentable over USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman as applied to claim 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 6,497,950 to Haile be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 5,892,197 to Patrick.

As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2. Claims 3-5, 8, 12-13 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and contain the limitations thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 8 as being unpatentable over USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 12-13 and 15 above, and further in view of USPN 5,892,197 to Patrick be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1, 3-5, 8-13 and 15 at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned agent at (740) 321-7213 if any unresolved matters remain.

If any questions should arise with respect to the above Remarks, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions to place the claims in better condition for allowance, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' agent at the number listed below.

Applicant authorizes any fees required pertaining to this response be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0568.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Maria C. Gasaway
Reg. No. 51,721

Date: December 1, 2005

Owens Corning
2790 Columbus Road, Bldg. 11-7
Granville, OH 43023
(740) 321-7213